REMARKS:

Claims 24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, and 65-74 were pending in this application. Claims 73-74 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 75 has been added. Claims 24-27, 33, 35-37, 41, 43, 44, 48, 52-54, 56, 61-63, 65, 66, and 68-72 have been amended. Therefore, claims 24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72, and 75 are now pending in this application.

The amendments and new claims are supported in the specification by at least the following passages and figures: page 3, line 7 to page 4, line 20; page 6, lines 5-15; page 7, lines 1-11; page 12, line 17 to page 16, line 16; Fig. 1; and Figs. 6-11.

Examiner Interview

Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the interview of July 13, 2009. During the interview, Applicant discussed amendments similar to the present ones in light of the cited art, and how the amendments distinguish over the art of record. The Examiner stated she would give due consideration to the amendments, but no accord was reached.

Claim Objections

Claims 24, 41, 48, and 58 stand objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims in response to recite "a location of a physical document," and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

Art Based Rejections

Claims 24-25, 27-28, 33, 35, 41-43, 45, 48-52, 56-57, 61, and 65-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0125714.) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009). Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to advance prosecution.

Claim 24 now recites a "computer system generating" a "unique time-based identifier identifying a date and time of day that [an] electronic document was received by the computer system;" "the computer system storing, in a storage array, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document in each of a plurality of tables of a relational database accessible to the computer system, wherein each of the plurality of tables includes the generated

unique time-based identifier as one of its respective plurality of attributes." (emphasis added) That claim further recites the "computer system accessing the plurality of attributes for the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding unique time-based identifier for the electronic document," "wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document." As explained below, no combination of Freeman, Johnson, Irons, or Cahill teaches or suggests each and every element of these limitations.

Freeman is directed to a "document stream operating system," Freeman at Abstract, and does not mention a "database" even in passing. Accordingly, as to the limitations of claim 24 that refer to a "relational database," the Examiner must turn to Johnson. As set forth below, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Freeman and Johnson does not include each and every limitation of claim 24.

Johnson is directed to a "'cradle to grave' system and method for managing records of an organization." Johnson at col. 4, lines 8-9. Johnson further teaches an "information location management [database] system" that allows an "organization" to "control the receipt, acknowledgement, validation, organization, destination, storage, retention and destruction of multi-format [electronic] and hard-copy records." *Id.* at col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 4. Johnson does not teach or suggest, however, the "plurality of tables of a relational database" recited in claim 24, "each" of which "stor[es] a respective plurality of attributes," where "each" "respective plurality of attributes" "includes [a] generated unique time-based identifier" (emphasis added). Because nothing in Johnson suggests such a plurality of tables, Johnson furthermore fails to teach or suggest a "computer system accessing the plurality of attributes for the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables *using the corresponding unique time-based identifier for the electronic document*" (emphasis added). Instead, Johnson's database merely describes, e.g., the placement of "incoming information" relating to "records." *See id.* at col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 4. As a non-limiting example, consider that Johnson does not disclose tables such as shown in the specification at Figs. 7-11, where each figure has an "**Entry_Date/Time**" shown (emphasis added).

Accordingly, even assuming motivation to combine Freeman and Johnson as suggested by the Examiner (which Applicant does not concede), the proposed combination would not include each and every feature of claim 24 for at least the reasons described above. As such, the

combination of Freeman and Johnson does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended claim 24.[1] Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under § 103 of independent claim 24 and its dependent claims. For at least similar reasons, Applicant furthermore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under § 103 of claims 41, 48, and 56, and their respective dependent claims. Claim 75 is also believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Several dependent claims additionally distinguish over the cited art. Claims 25, 35, and 36 collectively recite "first," "second," "third," "fourth," and "fifth" tables, <u>each of which</u> has a "respective plurality of attributes" as recited in claim 24. <u>Each</u> of these respective plurality of attributes includes a "unique time-based identifier" for "each of a subset of" "received electronic documents." The recited first, second, third, and fourth tables also include attributes respectively relating to (1) "an entity originating [a] given electronic document," (2) "a physical location of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document," (3) "a task associated with the given electronic document," and (4) "the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document." The fifth table (recited in claim 36) is "configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table." Applicant submits that the cited references additionally do not teach such recited details regarding the claimed "plurality of tables," and for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25, 35, and 36 are further patentably distinct over the cited art. For at least similar reasons, dependent claims 43, 44, 52-54, 61-63, 69-72, and 74 are also further patentably distinct over the cited art.

---

[1] Irons (U.S. 6,192,165) and Cahill (U.S. 6,181,837) have been cited in support of the rejection of several dependent claims; Applicant respectfully submits that these references also fail to teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 24.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-72402/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2009   By: /Dean M. Munyon/
                                            Dean M. Munyon
                                            Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847